of virtually innumerable particular mental abilities constituting intelligence.[178] It is difficult to say on which side Descartes would have stood in this debate, for his fundamental ambivalence regarding the nature of intelligence becomes most evident in the *Regulæ* through his attempt to give an account of the distinctions between the different manners of manifestation of the natural intelligence in both 'facultative' and 'functional' terms.[179] In other words, it is easy to see that in the *Regulæ* Descartes grasps 'ingenium' both as a faculty and as a function, whereas it is hard to discern which perspective is dominant. Perhaps the issue is undecidable on a general plane because it is primarily and ultimately a matter of the particular context involved.

*Second*, there is the debate about whether intelligence is a narrow, 'intellectual' phenomenon pertaining to the mind alone or a wider, 'moral' one involving the character of the whole person. Hand in hand with this, there is also a growing body of literature emphasizing the importance of traditionally neglected 'emotional intelligence' vis-à-vis traditionally emphasized 'cognitive intelligence'.[180] This discussion is, in a sense, a contemporary way of reposing the ancient Greeks' question about the relationship between knowledge and virtue.[181] For Socrates claimed that 'virtue is knowledge'[182] and no one really understood what he was trying to say until Aristotle delivered a profound interpretation of his statement, namely, that ethical virtue without dianoetical virtue is blind and dianoetical virtue without ethical virtue is empty.[183] To understand this felicitous elucidation of Socrates' thesis as an attempt at a refutation is to misunderstand both the original and the commentary.[184] While there may be something to the critique that Descartes' account of knowledge could and should be less heavily oriented on the intellectual faculties, abilities, and activities, one must also acknowledge that he does emphasize, for example, the role of the will in judgment, in truth, and in error much more than he has been given credit for. A classic case study is the – not only brilliantly subtle but also rather neglected – analysis of the intellectual and volitional aspects of judgment in the *Meditations*.[185]

*Third*, there is the debate about heredity and environment in regard to intelligence. Now the chief controversy concerning intelligence happens to center around how much each of these factors, in other words, 'nature' and 'nurture', is responsible for the

[178] Cf., e.g., J. P. Guilford, 'The Structure of Intellect', *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 53 (1956), pp. 267–293; 'Three Faces of Intellect', *American Psychology*, vol. 14 (1959), pp. 469–479; etc.

[179] Cf. esp. R. 12, § 10.

[180] Cf., e.g., Antonio R. Damasio, *Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason, and the Human Brain* (New York, 1994), and Daniel Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ* (New York, 1995).

[181] But only 'in a sense'. Actually, there are two distinct but inseparable issues here, i.e., the relationship between different kinds of intelligence and the relationship between different kinds of virtue. But the relationships sometimes criss-cross, as in Robert Coles, 'The Disparity Between Intellect and Character', *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, vol. XLII, no. 4 (Sept. 22, 1995), p. A68.

[182] Cf., e.g., Plato, *Protagoras*, almost passim.

[183] Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, bk. VI, passim.

[184] Two popular films of 1994, 'Forrest Gump' and 'Quiz Show', taken together, make the same point as Aristotle does. For it seems that Forrest Gump succeeds in life by being dense but decent, whereas Charles van Doren fails by being clever but corrupt. On the other hand, this is a superficial character analysis, for neither protagonist possesses what Aristotle would have regarded as complete virtue.

[185] Cf. esp. Meditation IV, passim.

Материал, защищенный авторским правом

level of intelligence that particular individuals or specific groups possess – the assumption being that both the percentage of factor and the level of intelligence are measurable, that is, quantifiable. Yet some of the often overlooked redeeming social value of Cartesian dualism lies precisely in the fact that, while Descartes does seem to get rather fixated on quantifying matter, he never appears to be very interested in measuring mind. And, as the full title of the *Rules for the Direction of the Natural Intelligence* indicates, Descartes would regard the proper employment of the intelligence as a matter both of heredity (or of the natural: from birth) and of environment (or of the habitual: from rules). In any case, the project of the *Regulæ* is to show how art – in the form of method – can improve upon nature (or how nurture can improve nature).[186] Therefore Descartes can hardly be counted among those who would seek to know for whom – but also against whom – the bell curves.[187]

Thus both Descartes' philosophy of rationality in general and his methodology in particular focus, not on measuring levels or grades or degrees of intelligence, but on improving the application of the natural intelligence. The classic statement of this position is found in the opening parts of the *Discourse*.[188] In other words, it is not enough for the human being to be a rational being; the human being must also be able to reason well. And the *Regulæ* represent Descartes' most extensive and profound set of reflections on how to exercise human rationality properly by reasoning well.

## *Philology: Manuscripts, Editions, Translations of the 'Regulæ'*

The point of departure for the present edition has been that version of the *Regulæ ad directionem ingenii* which has appeared in volume X (1908) of the standard edition of the works of Descartes. The new, revised edition of the original series, first published at the turn of the century (Paris: Léopold Cerf, 1897–1913), is: *Œuvres de Descartes* (vols. I–XIII), edited by Charles Adam and Paul Tannery (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin and Le Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1964–1976).[189] This edition has often been reprinted.

The authenticity of the *Regulæ* is beyond question. They are explicitly mentioned for the first time in the inventory of Descartes' 'writings on the sciences' which was compiled in Stockholm on February 14, 1650, three days after his death there.[190] This list, two manuscript copies of which survive,[191] refers to the *Regulæ* under the rubric:

[186] Cf., e.g., R. 9, § 4.

[187] Cf. Richard J. Herrnstein and Charles Murray, *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life* (New York, 1994).

[188] Cf. esp. AT, VI, 1–22. Of course, Descartes does believe that there can be considerable differences among the intellectual capacities of human beings. On the one hand, when he is emphasizing such differences, he tends to use the word 'esprit' (mind): Cf. AT, VI, 2–3, 5, 7–8, 10, 15–19, 21–22, 24–25, 27–28, 30, 32, 37–38, 54–55, 58–59, 61–62, 64, 69–71, 74, and 76. On the other hand, when he is emphasizing commonality among human beings in this respect, he is liable to use the word 'sens' (sense): Cf. AT, VI, 1–2, 10, 13, 24, 61, and 77.

[189] By the way, in the dating of the *Regulæ* Adam appears to be following Millet. Cf. AT, X, 486–488 ('… la date approximative de 1628 …'; '… la date de 1628 environ …'; etc.).

[190] See Baillet, *La Vie de Monsieur Des-Cartes*, vol. II, pp. 427–428.

[191] See AT, X, 1–14. One is in the National Library of Paris and the other is in the Library of the University of Leiden.

Материал, защищенный авторским правом

'Nine notebooks, bound together, containing part of a Treatise on Useful and Clear Rules for the Direction of the Mind in the Search for the Truth.'[192] In addition, Pierre Borel (fl. 1651) provides, in one of the earliest biographies of Descartes, a Latin translation of this inventory, where one finds the following item: 'Nine codices on useful and clear Rules for the direction of the natural intelligence in the search for the truth.'[193]

The French ambassador to Sweden, Hector-Pierre Chanut (1601–1662), who had served as an intermediary between Descartes and Queen Christina of Sweden (1626–1689) and with whose family Descartes had resided during the philosopher's own stay in Stockholm (October, 1649–February, 1650), brought the original manuscript of the *Regulæ*, together with Descartes' other manuscripts, back to the Netherlands, where most of them had been composed, when he became ambassador there (1653). Yet nothing came of Chanut's plans to edit and to publish the manuscripts.

Except for some manuscripts that still remained for a time with the ambassador,[194] the others were now sent to Paris and owned by his brother-in-law, Claude de Clerselier (1614–1684),[195] through whom Chanut and Descartes had first become acquainted. It was then Clerselier, a French government official and one of Descartes' original and strongest supporters in France, who assumed the responsibility for an edition.[196] Indeed, Clerselier would establish himself as Descartes' publicist, for he had perhaps been responsible for the publication of Descartes' treatise *The Passions of the Soul* (1649), and he would certainly be responsible for an edition of the philosopher's *Treatise on Man* (1664) and of his *Treatise on the World* (1677). Yet Clerselier was soon overwhelmed with work on Descartes' literary legacy and would not be able to publish the *Regulæ*.[197]

After Clerselier's death the paper trails off, with respect to both the manuscripts in general and the *Regulæ* in particular.[198] They were passed on to the Abbé Jean-Baptiste Legrand, whose ambition was a complete edition of Descartes' works, including the posthumous ones. But Legrand died in 1704 before the completion of the edition, and the task was then left to the philosophy professor Marmion. Yet he too died in 1705, and the papers eventually landed with Legrand's mother. Now no one really knows what became of the manuscripts after these lesser known figures got hold of them. Thus the original manuscripts that were handed over by Chanut to Clerselier, including the original Latin manuscript of the *Regulæ*, are now presumed to be irretrievably lost.[199]

[192] The list comprises 23 articles, marked alphabetically, with the *Regulæ* mentioned at 'F': 'Neuf cahiers, reliez ensemble, contenant partie d'un Traité des Règles utiles & claires pour la direction de l'esprit en la recherche de la vérité.' See AT, X, 351.

[193] See *Vitae Renati Cartesii summi philosophi compendium* (Paris, 1656), p. 18, and AT, X, 351: 'Codices novem de Regulis utilibus & claris ad ingenii directionem in veritatis inquisitione.'

[194] Cf. AT, X, 13–14.

[195] Cf. ibid., p. 13.

[196] Cf. AT, V, 615–618.

[197] Clerselier also published three volumes of Descartes' correspondence (1657, 1659, and 1666). In the preface to the last volume he complains about his lack of leisure and appeals for help in editing and in publishing the manuscripts and fragments in more volumes – but in vain.

[198] Cf. AT, X, 1–14.

[199] Cf. AT, I, XLVI–XLVII and XLIX; X, 353; etc.

Материал, защищенный авторским правом

On the other hand, a number of scholars did have direct contact with the original manuscript of the *Regulæ*. For example, in the second edition of the '*Logic of Port-Royal*' (1664)[200] the philosophical logicians Antoine Arnauld (1612–1694) and Pierre Nicole (1625–1695) employed an extensive extract, translated into French, from Rules XIII and XIV of the *Regulæ* – indicating that Clerselier had provided the manuscript. Also, in his *Remarques sur la méthode de Descartes* (1670) Nicolas Poisson displays knowledge of, by acquaintance with, the manuscript – once again via Clerselier.[201] Next, it is possible that Clerselier showed the manuscript to the Cartesian philosopher Nicolas de Malebranche (1638–1715), who in 1674/1675 published a work with a title strikingly similar to the French designation of the manuscript of the *Regulæ*, namely, *On the Search for the Truth, Wherein One Treats of the Nature of the Human Mind and of the Usage that One Should Make of It in order to Avoid Error in the Sciences*.[202] Finally, in his *La Vie de Monsieur Des-Cartes* (1691) Descartes' leading biographer Adrien Baillet (1649–1706), recognizing and appreciating the philosophical significance of the *Regulæ*, refers liberally to the manuscript – saying that Legrand made it available to him.[203]

A special case is that of the relationship between the manuscript of the *Regulæ* and the philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646–1716). For toward the end of his stay in Paris (1672–1676) he and an associate, the mathematician, physicist, and philosopher Ehrenfried Walter von Tschirnhaus (1651–1708), paid a visit to Clerselier in the course of which they viewed various unedited manuscripts of Descartes.[204] According to a hand-written note of Leibniz, one of the things that he saw on this occasion was a manuscript containing 'a discourse of Mr. Descartes [entitled] "*On the Search for the Truth*"' in which 'there were about 22 rules explained and illustrated – in Latin'.[205] Keenly interested in what they were seeing, the visitors had originals transcribed, and copies were later sent to acquaintances of Tschirnhaus in Holland as well as to Leibniz in Hanover. Thus it is conceivable, but not established, that the manuscript of the *Regulæ* was among those that were copied and 'distributed' in this way.[206]

In any case, Leibniz did soon obtain a copy of the *Regulæ*. For, although the exact date of acquisition is controversial,[207] he seems to have purchased – probably in 1678 –

[200] Of which see more below.

[201] See Nicolas-Joseph Poisson, *Commentaire ou remarques sur la méthode de René Descartes* (Vendôme, 1670), p. 76, and Baillet, *La Vie de Monsieur Des-Cartes*, vol. I, pp. XII–XIII.

[202] Cf. *De la recherche de la vérité, où l'on traitte de la nature de l'esprit de l'homme, et de l'usage qu'il en doit faire pour éviter l'erreur dans les sciences* (Paris, 1674/1675 [vols. I–II] and 1678 [vol. III]).

[203] Cf. AT, I, XLVII. Baillet refers to the *Regulæ* at the following places: vol. I, pp. 111–115 and 281–283, and vol. II, pp. 403–406, 471, 476–479, 481–483, and 486–487. He expressly cites the *Regulæ* at the following places: vol. I, pp. 112 and 282, and vol. II, pp. 477–479, 481, and 483. Cf., e.g., vol. I, p. 282: 'C'est un manuscrit latin, non achevé, qui est entre nos mains.' This marginal note refers to '*ses* [Descartes'] *Règles pour la direction de l'esprit dans la recherche de la vérité*'.

[204] See AT, X, 208–209, and XI, 661–662.

[205] See AT, X, 208 (sic): 'Il [Clerselier] nous [Leibniz and Tschirnhaus] montra un discours de Mons. des Cartes *de la recherche de la verité*; il y avoit environ 22 regles expliquées & illustrées. En latin.'

[206] Cf. Giovanni Crapulli, *Regulæ ad directionem ingenii: Texte critique établi … avec la version hollandaise du XVIIème siècle* (The Hague, 1965/1966), pp. XXII–XXIV.

[207] Scholars have given at least three different dates for Leibniz's acquisition of a copy of the *Regulæ*: (1) Adam assumes that it was September, 1670 (AT, X, 354). (2) Crapulli suggests that it was November, 1676 (*Regulæ: Texte critique*, pp. XIII and XVII–XVIII). (3) Springmeyer proposes that it was between May and September, 1678 (*Regulæ / Regeln*, p. XV).

Материал, защищенный авторским правом

a copy from Dr. Schuller in Amsterdam, Schuller being a member of a Spinozistic circle with ties to Tschirnhaus.[208] It would then be discovered much later by the scholar Foucher de Careil[209] among Leibniz's papers in the Royal Public Library in Hanover, where it is still to be found.[210] Thus in the apparatus criticus to the edition of Adam and Tannery the convention was established that the version provided by this manuscript be referred to as 'H'. But Leibniz's version is an inferior one, containing lacunae and errors, so that he was forced to emend the text.[211] Therefore, in order to distinguish between Leibniz's copy as he found it and Leibniz's copy as he left it, Crapulli – responsible for the critical edition of the *Regulæ* – refers to the textual emendations as 'L'.[212]

But – at least – two early copies of the *Regulæ* appear to have been made in Holland. For another copy, an apparently much better one, belonged, probably, to Johannes de Raey (or 'Raei') (1622–1701), a Dutch Cartesian active in Leiden.[213] Although this copy – like the original – is now presumed to be lost, some suppose that it was used for both the Dutch translation of 1684 and the first edition of the original Latin of 1701.[214]

Not at all oddly, the *Regulæ* were first published, neither in Latin nor in French, but rather in a Dutch translation entitled '*Regulen van de bestieringe des verstants*' (Amsterdam: Jan Rieuwertsz., 1684).[215] If de Raey's copy did serve as the basis for this edition, then the copy must have been available by around 1680. For the translator, Jan Hendriksz. Glazemaker (b. 1620) – an artisan occupied with the production of glass about whose intellectual biography little is known except that he too was a member of a Spinozistic circle in contact with Tschirnhaus –, died (1682) before the publication of the translation. The version presented by the Dutch edition is customarily referred to as 'N', since what is at issue is 'la version hollandaise', 'H' is already taken, and 'néerlandais(e)' is French for 'Dutch'. Still, what is telling is sometimes not so much the text of 'N' itself as the text(s) of the (missing) Latin manuscript(s) underlying it.[216]

The 'editio princeps' of the *Regulæ* was published as '*Regulæ ad directionem ingenii*' in Descartes' *Opuscula posthuma, physica et mathematica* (Amsterdam: P. and J. Blaeu, 1701).[217] But this first printed edition of the *Regulæ* in Latin also contains a number of flaws and errors.[218] In the edition of Adam and Tannery the version offered by this edition is referred to as 'A'. Once again, one cannot assume without further ado that the

[208] See AT, X, 354–356. Cf. the letter from Tschirnhaus to Leibniz from the end of 1678 in: *G. W. Leibniz: Philosophischer Briefwechsel*, ed. Preußische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin, 1926), vol. I, p. 429, no. 190.

[209] Cf. Louis Alexandre Comte Foucher de Careil (ed.), *Œuvres inédites de Descartes, Précédées d'une introduction sur la méthode* (Paris, 1859–1860), vol. I, p. v.

[210] See Leibniz's hand-written note: 'Ein latein Mstum de M. Des Cartes, dessen Titel: *Methodus inquirendae veritatis*' (AT, X, 354).

[211] See, e.g., Crapulli, *Regulæ: Texte critique*, pp. XVI ff. and XXV ff.

[212] See ibid., pp. XXV ff. and XXXVII.

[213] See ibid., p. XXI ff.

[214] See AT, X, 353, and cf. Crapulli, *Regulæ: Texte critique*, pp. XXII–XXIV.

[215] See Crapulli, *Regulæ: Texte critique*, p. 1* ff.

[216] See ibid., pp. XIV ff. and XXI ff.

[217] See AT, X, 356–357.

[218] See Crapulli, *Regulæ: Texte critique*, p. XIV ff.

Материал, защищенный авторским правом

text of the printed version, the editorial roots of which would also appear to lie rather in Holland than in France,[219] is identical in all respects to the text(s) of its (missing) original manuscript(s).[220]

Now the scholarly dissensus appears to be that, while it is possible that Leibniz's copy ('H') derives directly from Descartes' original,[221] the same does not hold for Glazemaker's translation ('N') or for Blaeu's edition ('A'), both of which are derived from a copy or from copies in between.[222] In fact, Crapulli goes so far as to assert that there is no immediate relationship between any of 'H' or 'N' or 'A' and the original manuscript of Descartes' *Regulæ*.[223]

To summarize, in other words, one only has to keep in mind the following significant stations along the early path of the *Regulæ*:

| | *Date:* | *Textual Development:* | *Existential Status:* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1628 | Completion of Original | 'O' – Lost |
| 2 | 1678 | Acquisition of 'H' | 'H' – Preserved |
| 3 | 1678 ff. | Emendation of 'H' into 'L' | 'L' – Preserved |
| 4 | 1680 (?) | Availability of de Raey's copy | 'R' – Lost |
| 5 | 1684 | Publication of 'N' | 'N' – Preserved |
| 6 | 1701 | Publication of 'A' | 'A' – Preserved |

Due to the lack of a genuine original, that is, the enterprise of establishing the text of the *Regulæ* is like comparing several different editions of several different morning newspapers with one another in order to find out which one is – or which ones are – accurate. It is a continuing process of definition with no real hope for definitiveness in any strict sense. For there are two Latin 'prime copies', to wit, 'H' and 'A'. On the one hand, 'H' contains numerous lacunae which 'A' does not. On the other hand, there are also numerous loci where it makes more sense to follow 'H' than 'A'. Therefore, as far as the Latin text of the present edition is concerned, no systematic attempt has been made to determine 'in principle' which manuscript 'in general' is better. Rather, the procedure has simply been to try to decide – on a case-by-case basis – which text fits more appropriately into which context. Thus the editorial choices have usually been based, not on correspondence, but on coherence. Such is the texture of this text.

[219] See ibid., p. XXIV: 'L'*editio princeps* de 1701 doit donc se reporter à la tradition textuelle déjà établie en Hollande.'

[220] See ibid., pp. XIV ff. and XXI ff.

[221] Crapulli posits an intermediate copy between 'H' and the original (*Regulæ: Texte critique*, pp. XVI–XX), whereas Springmeyer questions this position (*Regulæ / Regeln*, p. XII ff.). The point is that Leibniz's hand-written note concerning the validity of his copy is far from dispositive (sic): 'Diese Msta [including the *Regulæ*] sind noch nicht gedruckt, sondern ganz rar undt sind von des Autoris eigener Hande abgeschrieben' (AT, X, 354). But does this necessarily mean that Leibniz's copy is directly derived from Descartes' original? Thus Crapulli's question itself begs the question (*Regulæ: Texte critique*, p. XXV): 'Comment Leibniz a-t-il pu prendre ce ms. comme étant de la main de Descartes?'

[222] Cf. AT, X, 353 and 356; Crapulli, *Regulæ: Texte critique*, p. XXI ff.; and Springmeyer, *Regulæ / Regeln*, p. XII ff.

[223] See Crapulli, *Regulæ: Texte critique*, p. XXII: 'Il est donc question de trois mss.; mais aucun d'entre eux ne dépend directement de l'original.' Cf. ibid., pp. XXXII–XXXIII.

Материал, защищенный авторским правом